



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/676,020	09/29/2000	Steven M. Bennett	042390.P9236	3234
7590	04/20/2005		EXAMINER	AZAD, ABUL K
Thomas S Ferrill Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP 12400 Wilshire Boulevard 7th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90025			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2654	
			DATE MAILED: 04/20/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/676,020	BENNETT, STEVEN M.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ABUL K. AZAD	2654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 November 2004.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-23 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-23 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 29 September 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/01/04.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-3 and 5-23 are pending in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-3, 5 and 7-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Woods et al. (US 6,510,417).

As per claim 1, Woods teaches, “a system comprising”:

“a user” (col. 6, lines 39-40);

“a module to identify the user” (col. 6, lines 59-60);

“a voice user interface to facilitate communications between the user and the system” (col. 6, lines 39-40);

“a database to store contextual information pertaining to the user” (col. 13, lines 1-2); and

“the system to use user-specific contextual information to dynamically change the voice user interface, wherein the voice user interface alters navigational options through the voice user interface that are presented to the user based upon environmental information at the location of the user” (col. 24, line 30 to col. 25, line 65).

As per claim 2, Woods teaches, "an identity of the user and current location of the user" (col. 24, line 30 to col. 25, line 65).

As per claim 3, Woods teaches, "wherein the user-specific contextual information comprises: an identity of the user; and a current task of the user" (col. 24, line 30 to col. 25, line 65).

As per claim 5, Woods teaches, "wherein the environmental information comprises channel characteristic of a communication device that the user uses to communicate between the user and the system" (col. 13, lines 17-29).

As per claim 7, Woods teaches, "a computer program to dynamically generate the ordered delivery of heterogeneous information to the user" (col. 5, lines 45-58).

As per claim 8, Woods teaches, "wherein the ordered delivery of heterogeneous information is organized based upon the user-specific contextual information" (col. 6, lines 59-67).

As per claim 9, Woods teaches, "wherein the ordered delivery of heterogeneous information is organized based upon environmental information" (col. 13, lines 17-39).

As per claim 10, Woods teaches, "wherein the ordered delivery of heterogeneous information is organized based upon the sensitivity of the information being delivered to the user" (col. 33, lines 32-58).

As per claim 11, Woods teaches, "a telephony interface device capable of communicating to the user in a human voice" (col. 6, lines 39-40).

As per claim 12, Woods teaches, "a module to generate a grammar file to enhance the ability of the system to comprehend communications between the user and the system" (col. 9, lines 38-52).

As per claim 13, Woods teaches, "wherein the environmental information is communicated to the system by the user" (col. 25, lines 15-18).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 6 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woods et al. (US 6,510,417) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Goldberg et al. (US 5,970,446).

Woods does not explicitly teach environmental information is determined by the audio scene information at the location. However, Goldberg teaches environmental information is determined by the audio scene information at the location (Fig. 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use Goldberg's teaching of determining environmental information in the invention of Woods because Goldberg teaches his invention provide a highest percent of correct speech recognition by selecting the correct model using audio scene information of the location (col. 5, lines 1-6).

6. Claims 15-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woods et al. (US 6,510,417) in view of Kanevsky et al. (US 5,774,525).

As claim 15, Woods teaches, "a method comprising":

"using user-specific contextual information to change a voice user interface and using environmental information to change the voice user interface" (col. 24, line 30 to col. 25, line 65); and

Woods does not explicitly teach, "altering the security characteristics presented to the user by the voice user interface based upon the environment information at the location of the user". However, Kanevsky teaches, "altering the security characteristics presented to the user by the voice user interface based upon the environment information at the location of the user" (col. 6, lines 48-59 and col. 9, lines 8-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use Kanevsky's teaching of altering security characteristics presented to the user based up on the environmental information at the location, in the invention of Woods because Kanevsky teaches to protect against eavesdroppers gain access to the service or facility (col. 2, lines 24-26).

As per claims 18 and 21, they are interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 15.

As per claims 16,19 and 22, Woods teaches, "generating the ordered delivery of heterogeneous information to the user based upon the user-specific contextual information" (col. 6, lines 59-67).


As per claims 17, 20 and 23, Woods teaches, "generating the ordered delivery of heterogeneous information to the user based upon environmental information" (col. 13, lines 17-39).

Contact Information

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ABUL K. AZAD whose telephone number is (571) 272-7599. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, RICHEMOND DORVIL can be reached on (571) 272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



April 14, 2005

ABUL K. AZAD
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2654